

DEFT Meeting Notes - 9/10/98

1. Agenda
 - a. Species Team Evaluations
 - b. DEFT Model Runs
 - c. Policy Meeting Needs - Monday 1:15pm
 - d. DEFT Report
2. Introduction - Ron Ott
 - a. We need a new summary matrix for DEFT 2 alternative.
 - b. DEFT Report - exec summary; 15 page body; and species appendix; need teams to input sections to all three sections.
 - c. Show how DEFT alt ranks with Alts 1 and 2.
 - d. Show changes and explain.
 - e. Consistent with our last report.
 - f. Comment: salmon team can adjust numbers to include upstream and harvest
 - g. Q: How do we explain that DEFT is not best through Delta alternative?
 - h. Q: How do we make DEFT better?
 - i. Add where we go from here to our agenda.
 - j. We will suggest to Policy where we think we should go from here.
3. Delta Smelt Team
 - a. Need model runs to finish evaluations and see where DEFT falls.
 - b. Some things will be better.
 - c. DEFT is better than Alt 2.
 - d. Difficult to evaluate the benefits of the common program.
 - e. Have questions as to whether they can do what they say for Stage 1 within seven years.
 - f. Only benefits of Alt 2 came from common program.
 - g. DEFT alternative had benefits from VAMP and E/I changes.
 - h. Old River Flow at Bacon was key criteria.
 - i. Ag barriers are not recommended.
 - j. Dredging Delta channels are not a fish recommendation - should not be in DEFT.
 - k. Evaluation will be continue to have wet and dry year components. Changes in both types, but most in dry years.
 - l. Need a DEFT - Noname run for 2020 LOD to provide consistent evaluation material. Need to explain any biases we may have due to differences in LOD used in various model runs.
4. Salmon Team
 - a. In Delta habitat along river important ; as are exports and flows.
 - b. DEFT alt - better than alt 1 in Sac River; better than alt 2 in San Joaquin River; not better than alt 3.
 - c. Terry Mills broke out Stage 1 from Common Program to allow evaluation of the short term.

- d. In most cases the benefits were backend loaded. (Tuolumne was an exception.)
- e. Q: why should we except CALFED loading for Common Program?
- f. Differences between short and long term are significant.
- g. Upstream benefits are at recovery level for all but San Joaquin.
- h. Took harvest committee's recommendation that harvest actions will be +6.
- i. Weighting factors:
 - i. SR: 50-60; 30; 10-20 (Upstream; Delta; Harvest/Ocean)
 - ii. SJ: 40; 40; 20
- j. We added East Side Tributaries.
- k. Upstream we distinguished 4 runs; in Delta we integrated 4 runs.
- l. Q: did you consider benefits to rearing in Delta? A: yes; through benefits to shallow water habitat and food supply; direct benefit to rearing is uncertain because CALFED has not identified what exactly they would do in the Delta. Regardless, the DEFT benefit is the same as for other alternatives, so its only a question as to degree of recovery.
- m. Q: how did you account for upstream benefits in DEFT? A: Assumed actions upstream would lead to recovery. Did not assess indirect effects of DEFT actions such as on Shasta temperature. May need to pull water from storage to meet DEFT requirements in the Delta, which could affect temp releases from Shasta.

5. Model Runs - Gary

- a. List of runs
 - i. DEFT 1 - before NoName additions
 - ii. DEFT 2 - after adding Noname additions (also called DEFT-NOName)
 - iii. DEFT Half Exports Bookend run - Alt three export levels in DEFT.
 - iv. DEFT B - revised export reductions
 - v. NoName only.
- b. Our evaluation is on DEFT 2 with fish actions and water supply actions.
- c. Q: Do we try to balance benefits among resources? (Fish and water supply?). Do we share or do we increase fish and lower water supply?
- d. DEFT 2 is a bookend; as is DEFT B.
- e. DEFT 2 is better than alt 1 and alt 2 in the Delta.
- f. Q: why not add more habitat actions in the Delta, rather than the mix of new water for fish in DEFT 2? It takes too much water to get small fish benefits. A: we can't quantify habitat benefits yet - AM long term.
- g. Hood facility:
 - i. A means for adding 2000 cfs into the central Delta.
 - ii. Will this amount be large enough to test concept adequately?
 - iii. Will it be a valid experiment? Yes.
 - iv. We agree to include in DEFT 2.
 - v. Do we have to make central Delta more fish friendly first? Not necessary.
 - vi. Do we need a screen? Yes otherwise its just another cross channel that we would have to close. Can't screen DCC.
 - vii. For salmon its a net negative for Hood facility. Would benefit from proposed experiment at the end of stage 1 when a decision would have to

- be made whether to expand to alter 2 or 3.
 - viii. We need to consider the political controversy of including the Hood facility even as an experiment. People will simply think it is a precursor to the PC.
 - ix. Hood benefits SJ fish but not SR fish. We felt SJ needed more of a boost and that SR salmon would not be hurt much.
 - x. Where do we put Hood water? Into north fork of Mokelumne. Need to use the route defined in alts 2 and 3.
 - xi. We decided to carry Hood forward in DEFT with clarification of the tradeoffs and the need to carefully evaluate performance.
 - xii. Tradeoffs: knowledge gained, benefit to SJ salmon and water quality - versus - reduction in Sac Riv flow below Hood and loss at Hood screen. (And upstream blockage at screen.) Plus consider the perception issue - complicated.
 - h. We have yet to add the operational flexibility actions being developed by DNCT.
 - i. Where do we go from here?
 - i. DEFT will include habitat, structures, and operations (fixed and variable).
 - ii. How will this be precise enough for EIS? Range is OK for preferred alt.
 - iii. We will have tools for showing benefits of fish and water supply.
 - iv. Can we use these tools to get into the middle ground acceptable to DEFT and NONAME?
 - v. We can start with the bookends and work toward the middle over 30 years.
 - vi. Phase 2 report will outline our preferred alternative. May take 10 years of adaptive management to refine alternative.
6. All day tues meeting to write report.
- a.
- 7.